

THE INTERMOUNTAIN CATHOLIC

Denver A Catholic Paper for the Catholic Home Salt Lake Pro Deo, Pro Patria (for God and Country) Butte

Volume 5, No. 28, Fifth Year.

SALT LAKE CITY AND DENVER, APRIL 9, 1904.

Colorado Catholic, Twentieth Year.

RUSSIA'S POWER OF ASSIMILATION

How It Has Secured the Confidence and Good Will and Prosperity of the People of Manchuria.

(Howard C. Kelly, in the New York Evening Post.)
Admiral Alexieff's proclamation to the Chinese, offering assistance to be afforded to the Czar's troops, which is now being distributed throughout Manchuria, may appear an absurd document to the average newspaper reader who has never traveled in that country, but there is little doubt that it will be well received by the people to whom it is addressed.

To the outsider it must seem ridiculous for the Russians to expect help from the people whose land they have appropriated. The occasion might be expected to produce a formidable rising in Manchuria.

In all probability there will be nothing of the kind. The Russian has gained the hearty good will of the Chinaman in Manchuria. The genius of the Russian for assimilating his Asiatic conquests has never been more strikingly displayed than in his newest province.

The Russian administrators have done all in their power to make the Chinese feel that Russian rule is better for them than Chinese, and no man can travel through Manchuria without marveling at the remarkable success which has attended that endeavor. In every town and village the Chinese swarm, living on the most friendly terms with their conquerors, and in many cases holding lucrative and responsible positions under the Russian government. In many towns the Manchurian administrative officials have been continued in office and permitted to retain all their special privileges and emoluments.

The collection of maritime revenues is carried on by Chinese officials—men trained by Sir Robert Hart in the Chinese imperial customs, but now drawing Russian pay and wearing Russian uniforms. The collectors of inland revenue, too, are mostly Chinese, and there are many native officials in every department of the government and in all ranks of the service, excepting only the very highest. In pursuing his policy of conciliation, Admiral Alexieff has, in many cases, actually placed Chinese in authority over Russians.

Russian brains planned the rapid development of Manchuria, which amazed the world, but Chinese hands carried out the work. Hundreds of thousands of Chinese coolies cheerfully assisted in the Russian colonization of their own country. They built up Harbin, Dalny, Port Arthur, Blagovestchensk, and the other towns; they laid the Manchurian sections of the Siberian railway, and they have taken the largest share in the cultivation of the crops, for the Chinaman can raise more on a rood of ground than the imported Russian peasant can on an acre.

This latter fact is so well appreciated by the Russian authorities that they encouraged and assisted large numbers of Chinese peasants to settle on farms in the fertile zones around Harbin and Tsitsihar, in order that there might be no trouble over the food supply of the important town of Harbin.

FARMING ENCOURAGED.

These farmers have prospered exceedingly, helped by Russian capital whenever they needed it. Their produce is brought to Harbin by the Sungari and Nen rivers on a large fleet of boats operated especially for that purpose by Russians.

Before the war one of the most powerful men in Port Arthur was a Chinaman known as "Typhoon Tai." He was one of the viceroys most trusted lieutenants, having control, as a contractor, over many thousands of coolies. He started as a coolie himself, and never made much headway in the world under his own native government. But when the Russians acquired Port Arthur his chance came. Labor was in great demand for the construction of forts, docks and buildings, and he undertook to supply some of it. The Russians paid him well, and when he "made good" they gave him other contracts of greater importance. So, in a few short years, he has become a millionaire and a man of great importance.

Hundreds of other Chinamen have risen in the world, like him, owing to the Russian advent; and many thousands have grown richer in their degrees. The coolie's wages, for example, have gone up with a bound; and the prices of market produce have greatly increased. No wonder most of the Chinamen in Manchuria are loyal subjects of the Czar.

A Chinaman known as "Ivan"—the Russian's "old man"—is head of the Harbin Telegraph company, a quasi-government institution. He holds authority over many Russian clerks and operators, as well as over a large number of Chinese. "Ivan" speaks excellent English, and is a well educated, widely traveled, able man, thoroughly well fitted for his important position, which gives him control over the telegraph lines all the way to Port Arthur, Dalny and Vladivostok.

It seems to be commonly supposed that the Chinese dislike the Russians, with whom they have no racial affinity, and like the Japanese; but travel in Manchuria convinces one to the contrary. The Chinaman is quite willing to take the Chinaman as he finds him and to make friends with him as speedily as he can. There is no other white race in the world with so light a baggage of prejudices. The Russian soldier—and especially the Cossack—makes himself at home wherever the Czar sends him. As soon as he has finished with war, he settles down quietly among the people to learn their ways and marry their daughters.

In less than four years the Russians have managed to teach every Chinaman in Manchuria that he is a Russian subject to all intents and purposes, and the natives are quite willing to accept the position. An amusing pretense of Chinese sovereignty is still kept up throughout the province, but it deceives nobody. Chinese cavalry soldiers, employed and paid by the Russian government, patrol the country, with the permission of the Russians. On the stock of each soldier's rifle there is pasted a permit to carry arms, signed by the local Russian commandant.



REV. W. F. MORRISSEY.

EASTER SUNDAY AT ST. MARY'S CATHEDRAL

Magnificent Services at St. Mary's Cathedral—Father Morrissey's Eloquent Sermon.

"Resurrexit, non est hic!" ("He is risen; He is not here!") were the words of the angel over 1,900 years ago at the door of the Holy Sepulchre. The same words were joyously repeated last Sunday throughout the entire Christian world, when the feast of feasts was celebrated with all solemnity and joy. The prayerful Lenten days, the holy Passion time, the gloom of Holy Week, the agonized cries of Calvary were lost for the time in the Easter songs of praise, and the entire world sang Alleluia, Alleluia to the risen Savior.

Easter Sunday was gloriously beautiful—the morning dawned in a golden burst of sunshine, with not a cloud in the sky. "The smile of God and breath of Heaven greeted the earth on the Resurrection morn."

Easter was in very truth a day of gladness at St. Mary's. The early Masses were well attended and hundreds received Holy Communion. The angels of the Resurrection rolled away from many saddened hearts and burdened souls the stones of sin, ushering in the Easter of hope to the despairing.

During the Paschal time still remaining, many more hearts and souls will come, penitent and loving, like Magdalen to the tomb, offering their love—the sweeter after many days of sin and gloom.

The great feast was celebrated at the Cathedral with the usual impressive ceremonies. The altars were banked with hundreds of Easter lilies, festooned with dainty ferns and smilax.

Solemn Pontifical High Mass was celebrated at 11 o'clock by Rt. Rev. Bishop Scanlan, with Rev. Father Guinan, deacon; Rev. Father Morrissey, sub-deacon, and Rev. Father Kidy, master of ceremonies. The grandly eloquent Easter sermon was delivered by Rev. Father Morrissey.

THE SERMON.

"He is risen; He is not here!"

My Lord Bishop, Very Rev. and Rev. Fathers and Dearly Beloved Brethren: When victorious generals return from their wars, it is the custom for their nations to give them a triumph. They come in state into their country or city and all the people turn out to do them honor. It is the culmination of their campaign, the reward of their skill and valor. From the days of Rome to our own day the triumphs of great captains have been considered the height of earthly ambition—the cap and crown of earthly glory.

Today we celebrate the triumph of the great Captain of our Salvation, Jesus Christ—a triumph the greatest the world has ever seen, a victory to which no man before or since, has ever attained—the victory over death. And it is a victory whose reality and greatness no man can doubt. Relying on the Gospel narrative, and upon the innumerable references throughout the New Testament,

we must conclude that no fact in the world's history is more incontestably established; and yet we are brought face to face with its denial, by some at least.

But it is undeniable. The New Testament gives us evidence after evidence of the truth. God himself foretold His resurrection. The spirit of prophecy rested upon Him, and at times, for the sake of His followers, He lifted the veil that hangs beyond and revealed the vision, dimly it may have been, of future triumph and glory. When some would ask Him for a sign, He spoke of the sign of Jonas the Prophet: "For as Jonas was in the whale's belly three days and three nights, so shall the Son of Man be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights." When about to go up to Jerusalem for the last time, He foretold what would happen to the Son of Man: "They shall deliver Him to the Gentile to be mocked and scourged and crucified, and the third day He shall rise again." At the time of His glorious transfiguration on Mt. Thabor, when his favored Apostles would have rushed through the world proclaiming the miracle, "He charged them to tell no man what things they had seen, till the Son of Man be risen again from the dead." Again, "destroy," said he, "this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. But he spoke of the temple of His body."

These are but examples of His declarations to the effect that His suffering would be followed by joy. His night by day, His death by victory. His words were so understood and acted upon by the rulers of the Jews: "Sir," they said to Pilate, "we have remembered that that seducer said while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command, therefore, that the sepulchre be guarded till the third day, lest his disciples come and steal him away and say to the people: He is risen from the dead. The Jews, therefore, were prepared for any trickery."

The lifeless body was placed in the tomb, a special detachment of Roman soldiers, with instructions to more than ordinary vigilance, was placed on guard and the tomb itself was officially sealed. Despite these measures, Christ rose triumphantly from the dead. On the very day of His Resurrection He appeared unto the repentant and the rejoicing Magdalen, then to Peter, His Chosen Vicar, and to John, His beloved disciple. In the evening of the same day, He walked with two of His followers to the town of Emmaus, and later appeared to His assembled Apostles.

After the first day at least six separate appearances are recorded. As before His death, now after His resurrection. He conversed with His Apostles, spoke to His disciples, ate and drank with them. He brought certainty to the doubting Thomas, the sceptic apostle, whose fault begot those consoling words: "Blessed are they who have not seen and have believed." Upon a mountain in Galilee, in the midst of five hundred people, beside the sacred shores of the Lake of Tiberias, He appeared and spoke the words of light before which all lingering shadows of doubt were dispelled and the flower of hope was new-born.

All these proofs of Resurrection, however, fade into insignificance before the greatest proof of

all—the testimony of antiquity. The Apostles and their successors preached, not only in Jerusalem and Judea, but in the whole world, that Christ died in the Cross for the redemption of mankind, and arose again from the dead on the third day. The Jews and Gentiles were convinced of its truth and believed, and this belief has now existed for nineteen centuries, and is spread over all the earth. How could it be possible for this universal belief in the Resurrection of the Lord to rest upon error? Would not its fallacy, if fallacy it had, have long since been exploded? If the Jews and the Gentile had not been completely convinced of the truth of this mystery, upon which Christianity rested, what could have induced them to embrace Christianity, which condemned their vices and established customs, and imposed self-denial, abnegation and mortification of the flesh as a strict duty, while it held out to them in life, not a hope of reward, but contempt, sufferings, persecutions and even death?

"If Christ be not risen again," says St. Paul, "vain is our preaching, vain is your faith." Vain, indeed would have been the preaching of the Apostles and their successors against such odds, if this foundation stone of Christianity were but a myth; and vain indeed would have been the people's faith which rested on it. A vain preaching and a vain faith would have long since perished. Nineteen centuries of time would not have passed to find that preaching and that faith as fresh and as strong as ever. Had it been a vain preaching it would have been annihilated in the ten great persecutions which the power of mighty Rome had concerted for its destruction. Had it been a vain preaching it would have succumbed to the efforts of him who when dying was forced to exclaim: "Gallilean, thou hast conquered." Had it been a vain preaching, it would have been swept off the face of the earth in the avalanche of paganism, which from the north, broke through the gates of the empire. Had it been a vain preaching the third, second, and first century would have stood beside its grave.

In reality, brethren, if there be one fact in history, which is better entitled to credit than any other, I do not hesitate to say that that fact is the glorious resurrection of Jesus from the tomb. And this is the fact we commemorate today. Year by year on Easter Sunday the whole Christian world comes together to rejoice in this victory of Christ. He has gone through the valley of the shadow of death, He has broken the bars of the prison of hell, He has led captivity captive, and as he comes laden with the spoils of death, His people pour out to meet Him with the cry: "Resurrexit sicut dixit" ("He hath risen as He said.")

True, on the day of His death the enemy seemed to triumph. Beside the Cross the voice went up: "Beh! thou that destroyest the temple of God, and in three days buildest it up again; save thyself, come down from the Cross." Even then a word would have brought an army of smiling angels bearing fiery swords. Even then a word would have struck down His persecutors. Even then, did He desire it, that scene of death and defeat could have been changed into a heavenly victory. He could, but He would not, for He was then suffering for a guilt

IKONS VENERATED BY THE RUSSIANS

Sacred Images Are Carried In Battle—People Very Religious, Since Leaving Catholic Church Retain Catholic Doctrine.

(From Public Opinion.)

Press dispatches recently told of the ceremony, in which the czar intrusted to a regiment the care of the iron sacred ikon, purporting to bear a representation of the virgin appearing to Saint Sergius. This ikon has been kept at the Troitzko monastery in Moscow many years. It is about one foot square and is covered with precious stones. A most remarkable history attaches to the symbol, for it was carried into battle with Alexis, Peter the Great and Alexander I on all their campaigns. All of the battles in which this sacred ikon was carried are enumerated upon a silver tablet, and it is useless to say that it has always been defended to the last by the czar's soldiers. Another interesting custom in Russia is the manner in which the great commanders have prepared for the campaign. After fasting for a week they have gone to church, made their confession and partaken of the sacrament just previous to their departure for the front.

Regarding the worship of ikons, a writer in the Presbyterian Banner traces its history and development from the second council of Nice in 787, which demanded worship for images, but distinguished such worship from "true worship which belongs to the divine nature alone," declaring that "the worship rendered to the image went back to the persons represented by it."

The worship of images is much more deeply rooted and prevalent in the Greek church than in the Roman Catholic. The matter was settled for both churches by the second ecumenical council which met at Nice, 787. This council is the last of the councils whose decrees both these churches accept. The controversy over the use of images was very violent in the eighth century. The Byzantine emperors were divided on the subject. Leo III, surnamed the Isaurian, was an energetic iconoclast, and his edict of 726 excluded all images from the churches as contrary to the holy scriptures. His immediate followers shared his opposition to images. A radical change was introduced by the Empress Irene, who set aside the legislation hostile to images and called the council of Nice in 787. In this struggle ecclesiastics of the eastern church took different sides, and some who favored the use of images suffered death for it. The opposing the controversy were, without exception, on the side of image worship.

(The word worship here used by the writer is substituted for veneration worship is used in various senses, and invariably in the wrong sense when used by non-Catholic writers regarding Catholic sanction of images. Worship is frequently used to show the honor of one person to another in purely personal or civil grounds. A loving mother will worship the picture of a deceased child. When applied to the honor due to God, it has an entirely different meaning. This is fully explained in the catechism.)

Hadrian I took a particularly prominent part condemning, in 785, the Byzantine emperors for their iconoclasm, and through his representatives at the council of Nice contributing much to the passing of the decrees establishing their use. In spite of the subsequent iconoclasm of Leo the Armenian and other Byzantine emperors, the use of images was restored by Theodoros and has maintained itself in the Greek and Russian churches, and is commended in their more recent symbolical books. The decision in favor of image worship was greatly helped by the great theologian of the Greek church, John of Damascus. He was a warm advocate of the use and worship of images in the churches, but made a distinction between images and idols (ikon and idolon), and between two kinds of worship, one due to the Godhead alone and the other to images. While the decree of the second council of Nice is authoritative for the Roman Catholic church, the doctrine of that council on the subject of images was stated afresh in the decrees of the council of Trent. This council was intended to define the position of the papal church on the doctrines controverted and denied by the Protestants. After decreeing "veneration" and "honor" for relics, the council declared that "images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother and of other saints are to be had and retained, particularly in the churches, and that due honor and veneration are to be given them." It denies that there is any virtue or divinity in the images which are worshipped, because the honor which is shown them passes over to the persons they represent. In "kissing the images and prostrating ourselves before them we adore Christ and venerate the saints."

The walls of churches of the east are covered with sacred pictures, and while the priests of the Roman Catholic church makes a distinction between the image and the person it represents, the common people are apt to regard the image as a thing sacred in itself by virtue of a supernatural power residing in it. That no doubt is the feeling with reference to the little ikon which Russia has, according to report, sent before its armies, and of all the amulets and images blessed of bishop and priest which the people often purchase.

The deep-rooted character and universality of this veneration of the ikons is very forcefully portrayed by Senator Beveridge in his "Russian Adventure." Senator Beveridge inclines to the belief that there is less of superstition than of real worship in the custom.

The ikon is a little picture or image of the Savior, the virgin, or of some Russian saint. In the telegraph office on the Amur hangs the ikon; in the private office of the minister of finances at St. Petersburg hangs the ikon; in the saloon and in almost every room in the passenger boat on the Volga hangs the ikon; in offices, the ikon; in palatial homes of worldly wealth, the ikon; in wretched shops, the ikon; in the basest places of sin, still the ikon. Always and everywhere in Russia is this holy representation. It is the outward and visible emblem of a religious feeling, instinctive, profound, racial. These sacred images in one form or another are frequent in the streets of the great cities. A poor monk, as he passes it, takes off his cap; his body bows reverentially, his lips move apparently in the

(Continued on Page 2.)